



Dear Friends,

Good news and sad news fill this issue of the newsletter. Some sad news is that Harold Lief, MD, a courageous founding member of the FMSF Scientific and Professional Advisory Board, died in March. A very active member of the board, his papers and talks had a powerful effect on increasing awareness of the problems of memory recovery techniques. Dr. Lief, who was always professional and especially courteous, became the center of international attention in 1993 when radical “feminist” hecklers prevented him from making an invited presentation about false memories at McGill University. The irony of this event was that the hecklers gave enormous positive publicity to the Foundation, in no small part because of the contrast in Lief’s attempt to engage in a discussion and the hecklers’ refusal. Dr. Lief will be greatly missed.

Some good news is that the California Supreme Court tossed out all but one of the charges in the case against FMSF Scientific Advisor Elizabeth Loftus, Ph.D., for the 2002 publication of the article, “Who Abused Jane Doe? The Hazards of the Single Case History.” Nicole Taus, who identified herself as the “Jane Doe” of the article when she filed a lawsuit against Loftus, the publisher of the article, and three other people, is required to pay the expenses Elizabeth Loftus incurred in defending herself against the discarded charges. The other defendants and many of the initial charges had already been dismissed by lower courts.

The seeds of this case were planted in 1997 when David Corwin and Erna Olafson published an article about a person that Corwin had interviewed and videotaped as a child and later as a young woman. Corwin and Olafson claimed that they had documented evidence that people could repress and later recover accurate memories of abuse. Loftus and coauthor Melvin Guyer decided to investigate the case, but they arrived at a very different conclusion. Before they could publish their results, however, Nicole Taus filed an ethical complaint against Loftus at the University of Washington in connection with the research. Although Loftus was exonerated, her records were confiscated for almost two years.

The Loftus case continues to be of great interest to newspapers, writers, and others concerned with First Amendment rights of free speech. After Taus filed the initial complaint, the defendants filed a motion to have it dismissed, arguing that the lawsuit was a “Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation” (SLAPP). SLAPP suits are considered retaliatory lawsuits intended to silence, intimidate, or punish those who have used public forums to speak, petition, or otherwise move for government action on an issue of public interest. With one exception, the California Supreme Court agreed that the suit should have been dismissed, writing:

“[I]t is apparent when the determinations of the Court of Appeal and this court are viewed as a whole that the overwhelming majority of plaintiff’s claims properly should have been struck in the trial court under the anti-SLAPP statute. Under these circumstances, and consistent with the fundamental purpose of the anti-SLAPP statute to minimize the chilling of conduct undertaken in furtherance of the constitutional right of free speech, we conclude that it is appropriate to award defendants their costs on appeal.”

Loftus has vigorously denied the remaining charge — that she improperly intruded into private matters by misrepresenting her relationship to Corwin when she interviewed Taus’s former foster mother. Loftus’s attorney has stated that he is confident that Loftus will prevail. Loftus, in the meantime, has discussed her concern that in this whole legal tangle, an important person has not been heard from: the young mother who lost custody of her little six-year-old daughter. ^[1] Loftus is sure that her research shows that the mother was almost certainly wrongly accused. Indeed, the mother thanked Loftus for her work and both Loftus and the

In this issue...

<i>Wade</i>	5
<i>Legal Corners</i>	12
<i>From Our Readers</i>	13
<i>Kane</i>	15
<i>Bulletin Board</i>	17
The next e-mail newsletter will be sent in late June.	

mother hoped that there might be some sort of reconciliation with the daughter. Loftus still hopes that when the people who have encouraged Taus in her lawsuit stop encouraging her, that a reconciliation might still be possible.

More good news is the decision of the Canadian Supreme Court that memories enhanced by hypnosis are scientifically and legally unreliable and should not be allowed in criminal trials. (See p. 12) In the United States, the decision about whether to allow such testimony still varies by state.

There are more article reviews than usual in this issue because of the continuing stream of excellent papers that push our understanding of recovered memories forward. For example, would you believe that someone might come to think that he or she had proposed marriage to a Pepsi machine? On page 4, Seamon and colleagues report on an experiment in which this very thing happened.

On page 8, Howe and colleagues analyze the research and conclude that there is as yet no reason for the claim that "basic memory processes or their development conform to a different set of rules for maltreated children than other, non-maltreated children." This is an important conclusion since some researchers have suggested that children who dissociate should have poorer memories than children who do not and that dissociation is a way that a child copes with a traumatic experience.

In the recovered-memory literature it is generally assumed that trauma causes people to dissociate. On page 10, Merckelbach and Muris turn that notion on its head arguing that it is possible that dissociation encourages self-reported traumatic experiences.

Kimberly Wade provides a extensive critique of a new article by Steven Smith and David Gleaves who review recent literature on long-term forgetting. See p. 5. Wade points out that even though the article appears to provide a

fair review of the recovered memory literature, it fails to include important criticisms of some of the research they review and neglects entirely the extensive literature on false memories. This article is especially helpful in understanding how proponents and critics can come to different conclusions about what the research says.

In a recent issue of *Psychological Medicine*, Harrison Pope and colleagues published the results of their "Repressed Memory Challenge." See p. 9. The challenge was an offer of \$1,000 to the first person who could find an example in written works published before 1800 of a description of a person who had a repressed memory caused by a traumatic event. Since the publication of the article and ensuing publicity, the authors awarded the \$1,000. to someone who found an example in a 1786 opera. [2] Pope has indicated that this shows that the notion of repressed memories arose slightly earlier than he had originally thought. He and his colleagues are now working on another paper to explain more precisely how the concept of repressed memories appears to have evolved in the mid-1780s.

Readers will be saddened with the news of the death of Ray Souza. FMSF member Frank Kane wrote a moving tribute to Ray on p. 15. Ray and Shirley Souza epitomize the tragic situation of families caught up in FMS hysteria in 1993. They were convicted and kept under house arrest for 9 years for such bizarre claims as keeping their grandchildren in a cage in the basement, a basement that investigators never looked at or they would have seen that it had a huge picture window looking into it. It seems unlikely that such a conviction could happen now. There has been progress.

Pamela

1. Loftus, E. (2007, March 16). Personal communication.
2. Pope, H. (2007, March 27). Personal communication.



"There is general consensus that most individuals are more suggestible under hypnosis, that any increase in accurate memories during hypnosis is accompanied by an increase in inaccurate memories, that hypnosis may compromise the subject's ability to distinguish memory from imagination, and that subjects frequently report being more certain of the content of post-hypnosis memories, regardless of their accuracy. In sum, while it is not generally accepted that hypnosis always produced unreliable memories, neither is it clear when hypnosis results in pseudo-memories or how a witness, scientist or trier of fact might distinguish between fabricated and accurate memories."

R. v. Trochym 2007 SCC6, Supreme Court of Canada, Docket 30717, Feb. 1, 2007. Decision available at: <http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/2007/2007scc6/2007scc6.html>

"It has been argued in some quarters that an attack on RMT [recovered memory therapy] is an attack on psychotherapy in general. To the contrary, our hope is to support effective therapy as strongly as we can. By demonstrating that RMT is a dangerous form of treatment, adversely affecting the lives of the patients subjected to these techniques, and having a catastrophic effect on the family, we wish to enable professionals and their patients to discriminate between 'good' and 'bad' psychotherapy. Any 'good' psychotherapy has to help patients to understand and, if they wish, change their irrational and maladaptive behavior patterns. This can be done without recourse to pseudo-memories of trauma. There is enough genuine trauma to go around."

Lief, HI & Fetkewicz, JM. (1999).
Casualties of recovered memory therapy: The impact of false allegations of incest on accused fathers. In *Review of Psychiatry, Vol. 18*,
RC Friedman & JI Downey, Eds., 115-141

In Memoriam: Harold I. Lief **FMSF Scientific Advisor**

Harold I. Lief, M.D., a psychiatrist and emeritus professor at the University of Pennsylvania died on March 15, 2007. Dr. Lief was one of the first physicians to advocate the teaching of human sexuality in medical school. In the mid 60s only three medical schools in the United States and Canada had such programs. By 1980, only three did not. Starting in 1991, Dr. Lief was also known for his work in cautioning people against non-critical acceptance of claims of abuse based on repressed memories.

Born in Brooklyn, Dr. Lief received his bachelor's degree from the University of Michigan in 1938 and medical degree from New York University in 1942. He served in the Army Medical Corps during World War II and was the first doctor to enter some of the concentration camps at the end of the war. It was this experience, he said, that prompted his interest in psychiatry. After the war, he did his psychiatric residency at Long Island Medical Center and later attended Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons for psychoanalytic training.

Dr. Lief, a courageous founding member of the FMSF Scientific and Professional Advisory Board, remained very active in the fight against false accusations based on recovered memories. In this effort, he helped many affected families, served as an expert in legal cases, gave professional talks, and wrote professional papers. Indeed, Dr. Lief was one of the first professionals to speak out on the topic and in 1992 wrote:

"The horrors and consequences of legitimate sexual abuse should never be minimized, but there is another side to this situation—false allegations that destroy innocent families."

Dr. Lief became the center of international attention in 1993 when radical "feminist" hecklers prevented him

from making an invited presentation about false memories at McGill University. With his customary dignity, Dr. Lief "won the day" and provided enormous publicity for the Foundation.

Harold Lief touched the lives of many in the FMSF — families, retractors and professionals. He will be deeply missed. If you would like to share thoughts or anecdotes about your experiences with Harold, please send them to the Foundation. They will appear in the next newsletter.



Loftus Case: Court **Tosses All but One Claim**

Taus v. Loftus, S133805. Cal Sup. Ct. Filed Feb. 26, 2007. (Decision available at: <http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S133805.PDF>)

On February 26, 2007, the California Supreme Court ruled in the Taus v. Loftus case that journalists and scholars can be held liable for invasion of privacy if they misrepresent themselves in order to obtain information. In a 5 to 2 decision written by Chief Justice George, the court tossed out three of the four issues under examination. Justices Moreno and Baxter dissented, arguing that all four items should have been stricken. The court ordered that Taus pay the costs of the Loftus appeal writing:

"[I]t is apparent when the determinations of the Court of Appeal and this court are viewed as a whole that the overwhelming majority of plaintiff's claims properly should have been struck in the trial court under the anti-SLAPP statute. Under these circumstances, and consistent with the fundamental purpose of the anti-SLAPP statute to minimize the chilling of conduct undertaken in furtherance of the constitutional right of free speech, we conclude that it is appropriate to award defendants their costs on appeal." Majority opinion, page 78.

Readers may recall that Elizabeth Loftus, a courageous founding member of the Scientific and Professional Advisory board of the Foundation, and

Mel Guyer conducted an investigation into the 1997 "Jane Doe" case study published by Corwin and Olafson^[1] after widespread claims were circulated that the study proved that people could repress and then recover accurate memories of abuse. Loftus and Guyer arrived at a very different conclusion, but before they could publish their results, Nicole Taus and Lynn Crook filed ethical complaints against Loftus at the University of Washington in connection with the research. Although Loftus was exonerated, her records were confiscated for almost two years. In 2002, Loftus and Guyer published "Who Abused Jane Doe? The Hazards of the Single Case History."^[2]

Soon after the publication of the article, Nicole Taus filed a complaint^[3] against Loftus and Guyer. The complaint also named Carol Tavris, who had written about the Loftus/Guyer article, the *Skeptical Inquirer*, that had published the article, the University of Washington, and Shapiro Investigations, a firm that had helped Loftus and Guyer in their investigation. The complaint had four causes of action: negligent infliction of emotional distress, invasion of privacy, fraud, and defamation.

Some of the defendants filed a motion to have the complaint stricken. They argued that the Taus lawsuit was a "Strategic Lawsuit Against Public Participation" (SLAPP). SLAPP suits are retaliatory lawsuits intended to silence, intimidate, or punish those who have used public forums to speak, petition, or otherwise move for government action on an issue of public interest. The trial court denied most of the actions to strike and the defendants appealed. The Court of Appeal concluded that the majority of the Taus claims should have been dismissed, but it held that the legal case could proceed on four counts of action against Loftus. Loftus then appealed to the California Supreme Court. The case received

wide attention and the Court received a number of amicus briefs, especially because of its importance to First Amendment issues.

The California Supreme Court then reviewed whether the Court of Appeal properly concluded that the following actions against Loftus should remain. The four actions were: 1) Loftus defamed Taus in a talk at an October 2002 FMSF seminar in Chicago; 2) Loftus disclosed private facts about Taus in a deposition; 3) Loftus improperly intruded into private matters by collecting information from court records; 4) Loftus improperly intruded into private matters by misrepresenting her relationship to Corwin. The Court dismissed the first three actions and ordered that Taus must pay Loftus' legal expenses.

Loftus has vigorously denied the accusation of the remaining action that she misrepresented her relationship with Corwin when she interviewed Taus's former foster mother, Margie Cantrell. Ms. Cantrell has declared that she was contacted by Loftus in 1997 and that Loftus said that she was the supervisor of David Corwin. Cantrell provided some details about Taus's life. In the majority decision, Chief Justice Ronald M. George wrote that "personal information about a person that happens to be known by the person's relatives or close friends is not information that has entered the public domain." In their dissent, Justices Carlos R. Moreno and Marvin R. Baxter wrote that Nicole Taus had no reasonable expectation that her former foster mother would not talk about her. "The majority's desire to protect society from the kind of misrepresentations alleged in the present case is understandable.....will likely chill vigorous journalistic investigation because of the inherently problematic nature of the relationship between journalists and their news sources." The California Supreme Court ordered that

the claim be settled at the trial level.

An attorney who represented the news media expressed concern that the decision will cause problems for other journalists and investigators who may interview third parties. [4] He said that that it was not unusual for embarrassed news sources to later claim that they had been misled.

Supporters of recovered memories have claimed victory in this case. In a letter to the *Los Angeles Times*, Joyanna Silberg wrote that the California Supreme Court upheld the viewpoint of the Leadership Council, on human-subjects-research. [5] In its decision, however, the California Supreme Court on page 32, footnote 11, expressly noted that:

"[T]he Court of Appeal rejected plaintiff's claim that the first amended complaint stated a cause of action based on defendants' alleged breach of professional ethics, and plaintiff did not seek review of that ruling. Accordingly, the human-subjects-research issue raised by amicus curiae is not properly before us and will not be addressed."

Loftus's attorney said that he was pleased that most of the lawsuit was dismissed and that the Court decided that Taus must pay Loftus' legal bills. Burke said that Loftus will be able to prove that she did not misrepresent herself. "There was no trickery and no misrepresentation," he stated. "It was a four-hour interview and [the foster mother] knew who she was speaking to." [6]

Elizabeth Loftus commented that she is gratified that the vast majority of the claims were dismissed. She said that the one remaining claim is completely untrue. She also noted that in all of this case there is something missing: the voice of the falsely accused mother.

Thomas Burke of Davis Wright Tremaine in San Francisco represents Elizabeth Loftus. Julian Hubbard of Hubbard & Ebert in Redwood City,

California represents Nicole Taus.

1. Corwin, D.L. & Olafson, E. (1997). Videotaped discovery of a reportedly unrecalable memory of child sexual abuse: Comparison with a childhood interview videotaped 11 years before. *Child Maltreatment* 2, 91-112.
2. Loftus, E.F. & Guyer, M.J. (2002, May/June, July/August). Who abused Jane Doe? The hazards of the single case history. *Skeptical Inquirer*, Part 1, 24-32. Part 2, 37-40. Article available at: faculty.washington.edu/eloftus/Articles/JaneDoe.htm.
3. *Taus v. Loftus*. No FCS 021557, Sup. Ct. of Cal., Solano County. See *FMSF Newsletter* 12(3).
4. Dolan, M. (2007, February 27). Ruling may constrain researchers. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved on February 27, 2007 from <http://www.latimes.com/news/local/la-me-speech27feb27,1,4612801.story>.
5. Silberg, J. (2007, March 5). Ethical guides are already in place. *Los Angeles Times*. <http://www.latimes.com/news/print/edition/opinion/la-le-monday5.7mar05,1,7876122.story?coll=la-news-comment>
6. Ward, S.F. (2007, March). Interview methods face trial. *ABA Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.abanet/journal/redesign/m5research.html> on March 14, 2007.

Correction: Family Histories

In the last issue we incorrectly named the organization with which Laura Pasley is working. Following is the corrected version.

Laura Pasley is a retractor who has helped many FMSF families. She has recently become a consultant for a company that has developed a computer program that could help families write their histories: Heritage Makers. She thought that there may be families who have not written all the things that they want their lost children, and especially their grandchildren, to know, and that this could be a way for them to get started. Laura said "I know that there are lots of people who do not use computers. But someone in the family probably does. I have written the life story of my parents from birth through their marriage, children and grandchildren, for example."

If you are interested in more information about this, contact Laura at: <http://www.laurapasleyscreativecorner.com>. To see some examples go to "project search" and put "Pasley" for the author. You can also call her at 972-557-6709 or by email: lepasley@sbcglobal.net

Proposing Marriage to A Pepsi Machine

Seamon, J.G., Philbin, M.M., Harrison, L.G. (2006). Do you remember proposing marriage to the Pepsi machine? False recollections from a campus walk. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13(5), 752-756.

Could you make someone believe that he or she had gotten down on one knee and proposed marriage to a Pepsi machine? Readers who doubt that this is possible will be especially intrigued by the results of a recent study. This study extends previous research on imagination inflation by showing that false recollections can occur in real-life settings. In 1996, Garry et al. showed that just imagining events from one's past can affect memory for childhood events.^[1] Later research showed that the effect worked even with bizarre events, but most studies on the topic were done in research laboratories. Seamon et al. tested participants' memory for familiar or bizarre actions that were imagined or performed while the participants were taking long walks in familiar places on the campus of Wesleyan University.

The researchers selected 72 locations that were both indoors and outdoors such as a Pepsi machine in a lounge, the front stairs of the Psychology Building or a dictionary in the main library. In each place they provided a familiar action and a bizarre action that would later be associated with that place such as "Check the Pepsi machine for change," and "Get down on one knee and propose marriage to the machine." The experimenter read one action at each of the 72 stops and participants either watched the experimenter perform it, imagined themselves performing it, or imagined the experimenter performing it. Participants took two walks to some locations.

The results showed that imagining familiar or bizarre actions during the campus walk could lead to later false recollections of having performed the

actions. The effect of imagining was just as strong with one walk as with two. "Apparently, one vivid imagining during a walk that focuses on the perceptual or sensory details of the image is enough to sometimes establish a false recollection."

1. Garry, M. Manning, C.G., Loftus, E.F. (1996) Imagination inflation: Imagining a childhood events inflates confidence that it occurred. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 3(2), 208-214.



What Is Known About Recovered Memories?

Smith, S. M., & Gleaves, D. H. (2006). Recovered memories. In M. P. Toglia, J. D. Read, D. F. Ross, & R. C. L. Lindsay (Eds.), *The Handbook of Eyewitness Psychology*. Vol I: Memory for Events. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Review by Kimberly Wade

In a new chapter titled "Recovered memories," Steven Smith and David Gleaves (hereafter, S&G) discuss the latest research investigating how the brain might repress and recover information. Few chapters have reviewed the recent literature on long-term forgetting, so we were interested to see what this paper might offer. The chapter begins with a brief review of Freud and Janet's role in the study of amnesia and repression. Next, the authors clearly define some psychological jargon including the terms *repression*, *suppression*, *normal forgetting*, *amnesia*, *trauma*, *discovered memories* and so on. To be defined as a recovered memory, S&G posit that three conditions must be met: ^[1] an event or episode must be successfully encoded, ^[2] the memory must be inaccessible for a period of time, and ^[3] the memory must return to consciousness sometime after the period of inaccessibility. The authors note that "To some, the term 'recovered memory' also suggests that: 1) The events in question were traumatic, 2) Repression was the cause of temporary inaccessibility, and 3) Unconscious processes work to repress and recover lost memories of trauma." The authors then go on to report up-to-

the-minute research from the long-term forgetting literature, including Michael Anderson and colleagues' work on retrieval induced forgetting—experiments that show not thinking about words can impair one's memory for those words—and Steven Smith and colleagues' research into interference and cued-recall—experiments that build upon Anderson et al.'s by showing that forgetting effects are sometimes reversible (i.e., forgotten words can be retrieved) when appropriate memory cues are provided. S&G outline some of the clinical issues surrounding recovered memories, including the theory behind modern trauma treatment and the use of "memory work" in recovering long-forgotten memories of abuse. Finally, the authors list some frequently asked questions about repressed and recovered memories, and report the current consensus among psychological scientists on each of these questions. For example, they ask:

Are traumatic memories special?

Consensus: Most, but not all, would agree that memories of traumatic experiences differ from non-traumatic experiences.

Disagreements: Whereas some maintain that natural coping mechanisms, such as repression and dissociation, routinely act to protect people from re-experiencing traumatic memories, others believe that emotional experiences, including traumatic ones, are unlikely to be forgotten.

S&G's chapter provides a well-written and interesting review of how laboratory research into long-term forgetting might apply to real world cases of forgotten trauma. Indeed, the authors tackle important theoretical questions (e.g., What contributions has the research made to repressed memory theory and what are the implications for future research?) and applied questions (e.g., How does the research advance our understanding of a psychological problem and what are the

implications for policy?). The authors, however, fail to discuss some of the limitations of the research they describe; research they claim might account for how the brain ejects and then claims back traumatic information. They also fail to mention some important, recent findings in the literature that have brought us closer to understanding recovered memories. Since it is important to understand what memory scientists really know about recovered memories when debating this topic, we thought it would be good to outline some of the problems with S&G's chapter in the FMSF newsletter.

What does the long-term forgetting literature say about repression?

S&G describe two programs of research that they believe can tell us about the mechanisms underlying repression and recovered memories, respectively. The first line of research is that of Michael Anderson and colleagues^[1,2] at the University of Oregon. The central question in this research was whether individuals would be more likely to forget word pairs that they are instructed not to think about than word pairs that they are instructed to think about. In the Anderson studies, subjects typically participate in a three-stage experiment. First, they learn 40 word pairs (e.g., *ordeal*, *roach*) well enough to be able to report the second "target" word (*roach*) when only the first word (*ordeal*) is given. Next, subjects watch a cue from each pair (*ordeal*) appear on a computer screen. When the cue appears, subjects are instructed either to *remember* the corresponding target word (to think about *roach*), or to *suppress* the corresponding word (do not think about *roach*). Finally, subjects take a memory test in which they are given the first word cues and their task is to recall each target word. The results have shown that being asked to remember words improves memory for those words, and sometimes being asked to suppress

words impairs memory for those words. Anderson and colleagues, and others, have claimed that these results support a "suppression mechanism," similar to that proposed by Freud over a century ago.

The second line of research comes from Steven Smith's lab at Texas A&M University.^[3] Smith and colleagues have attempted to extend Anderson's findings by investigating how forgetting might be reversed in the laboratory, that is, how forgotten words might be recovered once again. In the Smith studies, subjects take part in a four-stage experiment. In the first stage, they learn 21 lists of words, such as, lists of fish, tools, sports and so on. Three of the lists are crucial and the remaining 18 lists are just fillers. In the second stage, the subjects are split into two groups: the *Forget* group views the filler lists several more times, whereas the *Control* group does nothing. In the third stage, subjects are asked to recall the original 21 lists. The results of this memory test typically reveal that *Forget* subjects are less likely than *Control* subjects to remember the critical lists. It is presumed that rehearsing the filler lists interferes with *Forget* subjects' ability to remember the critical lists. In the final stage, subjects are given yet another memory test, but this time those individuals who have forgotten the critical lists are provided with the category name (e.g., "fish") to jog their memories. The results show that these memory cues enable *Forget* subjects to recall the critical lists once again and to perform just as well as *Control* subjects. Smith and colleagues urge caution in generalizing their results to recovered memories of trauma, but they claim that the method may prove useful for learning about such phenomena.

What can the Anderson and Smith studies tell us about repressed and recovered memories? According to S&G, these experiments might help us to understand how the brain represses

and recovers emotion-laden, personal information. Indeed, S&G state that the Anderson research provides "considerable evidence of forgetting that is explainable by a inhibitory forgetting mechanism" and the Smith research "produces a very large and robust recovered memory effect." But does this research really show us how the brain represses years or even decades of brutalization before recovering it in a mostly pristine form?

According to many prominent scientists, there are several reasons why long-term forgetting experiments like Anderson and Smith's cannot explain repressed and recovered memories. First, the rate of forgetting in these studies is small at best. In writing about the Anderson study, Garry and Loftus^[4] noted that the suppression effect appears to be tiny. Even when subjects are instructed to suppress words they still remember approximately 80% of them, and this recall rate barely differs from the recall rate of words that subjects are instructed to remember. Such a minuscule effect cannot explain massive repression. S&G do acknowledge this problem, "such effects... do not seem to account for the magnitude of forgetting effects one might associate with repression or amnesia." Second, a prominent research group at Washington University has failed to replicate Anderson's findings, despite numerous attempts to do so. In a forthcoming paper in *Memory & Cognition*, John Bulevich and colleagues^[5] describe how they attempted to find a suppression effect in three separate experiments, but despite their efforts they failed to do so. Third, one problem that applies to the Anderson research but not the Smith research is that the suppression experiments do not show memory recovery, that is, they may demonstrate forgetting or inaccessible memories, but they do not demonstrate memory retrieval. The Smith research addresses this concern but their find-

ings are not all that surprising. Memory scientists have known for several decades that retrieval cues improve memory. Another problem with the Smith research involves the criterion for recovering a memory. To be considered as recovering a memory, all subjects needed to do was recall one member of a critical list. In other words, subjects were only required to recall 1/12 of the target event to be categorized as presenting a recovered memory. Finally, even if these repression and recovery effects exist, we still have to wonder, what, if anything, can suppression and cued-retrieval effects tell us about banishing traumatic experiences? Since the emergence of the suppressed memory research, some memory scientists such as Daniel Schacter^[6] and John Kilhstrom^[7], have expressed their skepticism about generalizing suppression effects to repressed memories. At this stage, we do not know, but it is of course possible that such effects are restricted to memories for mundane words or peripheral details in pallid events. If so, the suppression literature tells us little about the mechanisms responsible for repressed and recovered memories.

What do we know about memory recovery in therapy?

Towards the end of the chapter, S&G discuss some of the clinical aspects of recovered memories. In particular, they discuss whether memories that are recovered in therapy are likely to be the result of questionable therapeutic techniques. To address this issue, S&G cite research by Leavitt^[8] that showed that recovered memories were less likely to occur in psychotherapy, and when they do occur in therapy, recovered memories are often additional memories recovered while working on continuously remembered experiences. S&G concluded that Leavitt's results "obviously do not support the position that suggestibility is responsible for reports of recovered memories." Interestingly, since S&G's

chapter went to print last year, new research by Elke Geraerts^[9] and colleagues at Maastricht University has provided evidence that memories retrieved in therapy are less likely to be accurate than memories retrieved outside of therapy. The Geraerts study found that discontinuous memories of childhood abuse were more likely to be corroborated by other individuals if they were recalled outside therapy rather than in therapy. In fact, Geraerts and colleagues failed to find any corroborative evidence for the 16 abuse cases that participants recalled in therapy, but they were able to verify 37% of cases that participants recalled outside therapy. The Geraerts research shows that memories recovered in therapy may differ in important ways to those recovered outside therapy.

How does the false memory literature fit into a discussion about recovered memories?

We were surprised to see that the S&G chapter completely ignores the massive body of research that shows individuals can come to confidently believe and remember significant events that never happened. In a previous paper, Gleaves^[10] claimed, "when people misremember, what they do remember is likely to be consistent with their existing schemas or perhaps with their actual experiences." In other words, Gleaves seems to believe that people rarely develop false memories of implausible events. Now, if this were true, would subjects in false memory studies come to believe or remember witnessing an individual being possessed,^[11] rubbing chalk all over their own head,^[12] or proposing marriage to a Pepsi machine?^[13] The answer is, probably not.

In sum, S&G are clearly out to revive the concept of repression. Their chapter appears to provide a comprehensive and fair review of the recovered memory literature, but we believe the authors failed to discuss some highly relevant issues. That is, they failed

to outline important criticisms of the long-term forgetting research and the extensive literature on false memories that is highly relevant to the discussion of repression.

1. Anderson, M. C., & Green, C. (2001). Suppressing unwanted memories by executive control. *Nature*, 410, 366-369.
2. Anderson, M. C., & Spellman, B. A. (1995). On the status of inhibitory mechanisms in cognition: Memory retrieval as a model case. *Psychological Review*, 102, 68-100.
3. Smith, S. M. et al. (2003). Eliciting and comparing false and recovered memories: An experimental approach. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 17, 251-279.
4. Garry, A., & Loftus, E. F. (2004). I am Freud's Brain. *Skeptical Inquirer*, 28, 16-18.
5. Bulevich, J. B., Roediger, H. L., Balota, D. A., & Butler, A. C. (In press). Failures to find suppression of episodic memories in the think/no-think paradigm. *Memory & Cognition*.
6. Schacter, D. L. (2001). Suppression of unwanted memories: repression revisited? *The Lancet*, 357, 1724-1725.
7. Kihlstrom, J. F. (2002). No need for repression [comment on "Inhibitory processes and the control of memory retrieval" by B. J. Levy & M. C. Anderson]. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 6: 502.
8. Leavitt, F. (1997). False attribution of suggestibility to explain recovered memory of childhood sexual abuse following extended amnesia. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 21, 265-272.
9. Geraerts, E., Schooler, J. W., Merckelbach, H., Jelicic, M., Hauer, B. J. A., & Ambadar, Z. (In press). The reality of recovered memories: Corroborating continuous and discontinuous memories of childhood sexual abuse. *Psychological Science*.
10. Gleaves, D. H., (2006). Dialectical repression theory. *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 29, 520-521.
11. Mazzoni, G. A. L., Loftus, E. F., & Kirsch, I. (2001). Changing beliefs about implausible autobiographical events: A little plausibility goes a long way. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 7, 51-59.
12. Thomas, A. K., Bulevich, J. B., & Loftus, E. F. (2003). Exploring the role of repetition and sensory elaboration in the imagination inflation effect. *Memory & Cognition*, 31, 630-640.
13. Seamon, J. G., Philbin, M. M., & Harrison, L. G. (2006). Do you remember proposing marriage to the Pepsi machine? False recollections from a campus walk. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 13, 752-756.

Dr. Kimberly Wade is an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Warwick (UK). Dr Wade's research on human memory distortions has appeared in many international journals and has been presented at both national and international conferences.

The FMSF will welcome a response from Smith & Gleaves.



Does Trauma Affect Children's Basic Memory Processes

Howe, M.L., Toth, S.L. & Cicchetti, D. (2006). Memory and developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Developmental Neuroscience 2nd Ed.*, Vol. 2, pp. 629-655. New York: Wiley.

Howe, M.L., Cicchetti, D., Toth, S.L. (2006). Children's basic memory processes, stress, and maltreatment. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 759-769.

There are theoretical reasons to think that stress, especially caused by early childhood experiences such as maltreatment, would produce changes in the basic memory processes (encoding, storage, retrieval, and retention) of developing children. In the articles above, Howe and colleagues survey the research literature to test that assumption. They examine studies of memory of normal children that provide them with a baseline against which they can compare memory processes of children who have been traumatized. The authors observe that their work shows that it is extremely difficult to find any evidence that the chronic stress of child abuse adversely affects children's basic memory processes. The research shows that the basic memory processes of maltreated children do not differ reliably from that of non-maltreated children.

For example, some researchers have suggested that children who have PTSD should have poorer memories than children who do not. However, studies have shown that children's memory performance is not related to a clinician's diagnosis of PTSD. Researchers have suggested that children who dissociate should have poorer memories than children who do not. Although dissociation has been considered a way that a child copes with a traumatic experience, dissociation should also limit the amount of information that the child encodes during the event or isolate the traumatic memories after the event thus making it dif-

ficult for the child to access the memory. Yet, Howe et al. note "children as young as 3 years of age who were the victims of maltreatment and scored high on measures of dissociation actually had more detailed memories of their abuse than did children who scored low on dissociation." (Howe, Cicchetti, & Toth p. 763)

Howe et al. show repeatedly that the research fails to support some of the more familiar theories. For example, Betrayal Trauma Theory argues that children who are abused by caretakers or parents are more likely to have amnesia for their abuse because children need to maintain their attachment to the abusers in order to survive. It is the status of the abuser that determines whether a child forgets, not the number of times the child is abused. However, all the evidence shows that abuse tends to be remembered. Indeed, there were no incest survivors who had ever forgotten their abuse in Russell's (1999) epidemiologic study. Goodman et al. (2003) found that there was no relationship between the status of the abuser and a failure to report abuse years later. "There is little or no support for the idea that incest survivors experience amnesia for their abuse." (Howe, Toth & Cicchetti p. 636)

The argument that "the body remembers" abuse also lacks empirical evidence. Van der Kolk has argued that the stress hormones released during

"A paradox awaits them [retractors]. On the one hand, their distress warrants professional help; on the other, they have lost trust in mental health professionals and are thrown back into their own resources at a time when their coping skills have been undermined by recovered memory therapy. For these patients, perhaps we should create a new definition of PTSD—'Post Therapy Stress Disorder.'"

Lief, HI & Fetkewicz, JM. (1997)
Construction of false memory syndrome:
A transactional model.
Psychological Inquiry, 8. 303-306

trauma create state-dependent memories of the event that are not accessible to explicit memory. He argues that these memories are not subject to the same deterioration as other memories and they may return spontaneously in flashbacks, dreams, or body memories. However, Howe et al. point out that the stress hormones do not prevent declarative memories from being formed; indeed, they enhance the consolidation of the abuse memories. In addition, there is no evidence that someone with state-dependent memories would be amnesic for it. And Howe et al. note:

"Even if implicit memories did return as bodily sensations, unexplained feelings, and flashbacks, there is nothing in implicit memory traces that reveal their source. That is, such traces do not contain information that indexes their origin, and hence it is impossible to use them to accurately re-create the original experience.... Moreover, such memories are not stored in muscle tissue—the idea of "body memories" is inconsistent with the cognitive neuroscience of memory, even the neuroscience of traumatic memories... In fact, animal research has shown that there is no such thing as indelibly etched emotional memories." (Howe, Toth & Cicchetti p. 637)

Howe et al. note that research about trauma and memory is in its infancy. They suggest that future studies should be conducted on people who have actually experienced trauma and not extrapolated from normal populations. Future studies should be longitudinal and the tests more sensitive. They write "until that time, the studies reviewed here provide no rationale for the claim that basic memory processes or their development conform to a different set of rules for maltreated children than other, non-maltreated children." (Howe, Toth & Cicchetti p. 766)

□

Utah's License Board Investigates Barbara Snow

On January 12, 2007, Utah's Professional Licensing division filed

an action against Barbara W. Snow. The discipline notice alleges that Snow has been unprofessional in her conduct and has violated a number of Utah codes as well as the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics. No date is set for a hearing.

Barbara Snow's name may be familiar to many FMSF Newsletter readers. In addition to a number of legal cases in which judges have criticized her techniques, [1] Snow was a coauthor of some papers from the early 1990s that were highly influential. One paper helped to fuel the satanic ritual abuse scare [2] and another was often cited as the way in which children disclosed sexual abuse. [3] A recent critique of these papers included a quote from a judge in one of the legal cases in which Snow played a critical role: [4]

Indeed, Dr. Snow herself admitted that she used interrogation procedures that were not intended to sift truth from error. She forthrightly admitted she was not a neutral interviewer; rather she was "an ally for the child," "biased," and not a fact collector like the police.... She also testified in effect that there was nothing in her methods that served as a standard for determining the truthfulness of the stories she produced by her interrogation.... But since she starts an interrogation with the assumption that abuse occurred, she then proceeds to prove that point.... In short, any claim that scientific principles or Dr. Snow's own expertise and experience validated her conclusions and procedures is devastatingly refuted by her own statement, "I didn't believe any of those kids when they told me it didn't happen." (State v. Bullock, 1989, p. 175) reprinted in London et al. (2005).

According to the Salt Lake Tribune [5] the complaint against Snow also states "when state investigators questioned Snow, she allegedly provided them with made-up notes about those sessions." In addition, the complaint noted, "on one occasion, Snow went to [a] woman's house and used a baseball bat to destroy computer

equipment and other property she had taken there at an earlier time."

We will watch for developments in the Barbara Snow case. Many families were surely harmed needlessly by her zealotry over the past 17 years. It has taken a long time for the license board to take notice. Will the board take firm action now?

1. For example: *State v Bullock*, 791 P.2d 155 (Utah 1989). *State v Hadfield*, 788 P.2d 506 (Utah 1990).
2. Snow, B. & Sorensen, T. (1990) Ritualistic child abuse in a neighborhood setting. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5(4), 474-487.
3. Sorensen, T & Snow, B. (1991). How children tell: The process of disclosure in child sexual abuse. *Child Welfare*, 70(1), 3-15.
4. London, K., Bruck, M., Ceci, S.J. & Shuman, D.W. (2005). Disclosure of child sexual abuse. What does the research tell us about the ways that children tell? *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 11(1), 194-226.
5. Rosetta, L. (2007, January 20). Therapist under investigation. Salt Lake Tribune retrieved January 21, 2007 from http://www.sltrib.com/news/ci_5051155.



The Repressed Memories Challenge

Pope, H.G., Poliakoff, M.B., Parker, M.P., Boynes, N., Hudson, J.I. (2007). Is dissociative amnesia a culture-bound syndrome? Findings from a survey of historical literature.

Psychological Medicine, 37, 225-233.

In the May/June 2006 FMSF Newsletter, we printed Harrison Pope and colleague's offer of \$1,000 to the first person who could find an example in written works published before 1800 of a description of a person who had a repressed memory caused by a traumatic event. Specifically, the investigators sought a case where an individual experienced a severe traumatic event, then was unable to remember it for a period of months or years and then "recovered" the memory. The authors suggested that "natural human psychological phenomena, such as depression, anxiety, delusions, hallucinations and dementia" have been documented in both fiction and non-fiction throughout history. If dissociative amnesia were a natural human psychological phenomenon, it too should be noted. Although the

researchers were aware of many examples of repressed memories in published works after 1800 such as Rudyard Kipling's novel, *Captains Courageous*, and many contemporary movies such as *Batman Forever*, *Prince of Tides*, and *The Bad Seed*, they were not aware of mention of repressed memories in works published prior to 1800.

The authors observed that powerful new internet search engines and greatly expanded databases now offer the opportunity for searches into even obscure works. With their challenge they hoped to put many people to work looking for examples. Pope and his colleagues advertised the challenge in three languages on more than 30 Internet sites. Although the challenge generated more than 100 responses, no one came up with an example that met the researchers' criteria.

Pope et al. discuss four hypotheses that might explain the findings. The first is that dissociative amnesia is a natural phenomenon that has been portrayed in literature but that the searches failed to find examples. Since it is almost impossible to prove a negative, this hypothesis cannot be totally abandoned, but, the authors note, that given the widespread nature of the search, it is an unlikely explanation.

The second hypothesis is that dissociative amnesia has always been present but that no one wrote about it before 1800, or if they observed it, they interpreted it differently from us. The authors think this is unlikely since other phenomena such as depression, anxiety, etc. were all described. Even though writers before 1800 had different views of delusions and hallucinations, the early descriptions are identifiable. The authors noted that experiencing a horrible trauma such as being raped or seeing family members killed and then being unable to remember afterwards is such a graphic phenomenon that a description would be recognizable even if our ancestors had no

psychological conception of what they witnessed. The absence of any such description prior to 1800, therefore, cannot be explained simply by saying that our ancestors could not understand the phenomenon.

The third hypothesis is that dissociative amnesia is a natural phenomenon but did not afflict people until the last 200 years. The authors argue that if dissociative amnesia represented an innate ability, our ancestors would also have shown it. If a modern child could openly “repress” a memory of being sexually abused without being “taught” how to do it, then a child in Elizabethan England or classical Greece presumably would have been able to do the same thing. The authors note that modern individuals would not have some “unique claim to a special brand of trauma that our predecessors never experienced.”

The authors concluded that by default, therefore, one is left only with a fourth hypothesis, namely that that dissociative amnesia is not an “innate, naturally occurring phenomenon but rather a product of modern Western culture.” Pope et al. speculate that it flourished because it occupied a fertile niche in the culture.

Describing something as a “culture-specific syndrome” does not mean that it is imaginary or that people are malingering. A culture-specific syndrome shows how people’s minds can decide that symptoms are connected and shows how a particular society defines disease. People suffer equally in naturally occurring or culture-specific syndromes.

Pope et al. suggest that dissociative amnesia could better be classified with other “conversion disorders,” a term essentially synonymous with pseudoneurological conditions that lack a neurological base. They observe that classifying dissociative amnesia as a conversion disorder would bring the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual* of the American Psychiatric Association

into congruence with the existing *International Classification of Diseases, 10th Ed.*, which is the international counterpart to the *DSM IV*.

The article has generated a good amount of publicity. Some proponents of the reality of recovered memories claim that the criteria used by Pope are not right, but most comments have been favorable. Harvard psychologist Richard McNally indicated that the implication of the Pope et al. study is that therapists should focus attention on treating patients for the symptoms that they show, such as depression, rather than assuming that hidden memories are the source of the patient’s problems.

A copy of this paper is available at:
<http://www.biopsychlab.com>



Does Trauma Cause Dissociative Symptoms?

Merckelbach, H. & Muris, P. (2001). The causal link between self-reported trauma and dissociation: a critical review. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 39, 245-254.

This paper examines the relationship between traumatic experiences and dissociative symptoms. In much of the clinical literature it is assumed that dissociative symptoms are caused by a traumatic experience. It is common to read that a child dissociates as a way of surviving the trauma of sexual abuse. The authors note that the primary source of evidence for this view comes from studies that used both self-reports and scores on the Dissociative Experience Scale (DES).

The authors evaluated what they considered to be the very best studies in the field. They noted that some of the studies do not support any kind of robust linkage between trauma and dissociation. They also noted that some studies found that there is not a direct causal link between trauma and dissociation but rather show evidence that there may be another variable such as family pathology that is involved.

Most important, they found that the “studies cited as evidence for the idea that trauma causes dissociation often relied on the DES.” The authors note that the measure of dissociation overlaps with personality features such as fantasy proneness and that this may “compromise the accuracy of retrospective self-reports of trauma.”

The authors conclude that those personality features associated with dissociation (fantasy proneness, heightened suggestibility, and susceptibility to pseudomemories) may promote a positive response bias to retrospective self-reports of traumatic experience. It is possible that dissociation encourages self-reported traumatic experiences, just the opposite of the common belief.



Correction

As current chairperson of the Australian organisation ASCA (Advocates for Survivors of Child Abuse) it has been brought to my attention that there has been mention in your newsletter (Nov/Dec 06, Vol. 15, No. 6) of the article about Liz Mullinar and Mayumarri (Christian Healing Centre in New South Wales, Australia), which was written by Richard Guilliat and published in the *Australian Weekend Magazine* in September 2006.

Because you presented the information in this article as relating to ASCA, I would like to clarify for your readers the fact that, although ASCA was founded originally by Liz Mullinar, ASCA and Mayumarri have been completely separate organizations—legally and financially—since 2003.

The article referred to in your newsletter related to activities at Mayumarri alone, and had no relevance to ASCA.

Thank you,
Bev McCallum, ASCA Chair
Email: bmccallum@asca.org.au

Growing Up With A Mom Obsessed by Satanic Cults

Bishop, B. (2007, February 13).
Overcoming child trauma.
The Register-Guard, p. 1.

(Many families have written to the Foundation to ask what happens to the children of people who believe they were abused in satanic cults. A recent article tells about one such person.)

Hannah Caron was studying psychology at the University of Oregon when a paper was published claiming a link between adverse experiences in childhood and certain illnesses, addiction and suicide. [1] Caron joined a project to help others recover from painful childhood trauma. [2]

Ms. Caron had a traumatic childhood as “the only child of a mentally

ill woman.” Caron’s mother believed that she and her daughter had been involved in ritual abuse. The mother was convinced that they had been brainwashed by a cult that still pursued them. As a result, Caron and her mother moved at least 52 times in 15 years, sometimes living on the streets. Caron was in and out of foster homes. She ran away when she was a freshman in high school when she realized that her mother might be seriously mentally ill. She lived on the street and began using drugs. After having been committed to a mental hospital where she received treatment, Caron was helped by friends and distant family members and was able to go on with her life.

As for the ritual abuse, Caron says “It never wasn’t true for me...” “It

always was a component of my life. She wasn’t able to function because of her fears.” Caron still has nightmares and she wonders, if any of her mother’s beliefs were true. But she says “I no longer live in a constant state of fear.”

Caron currently works as part of a treatment team with severely abused children. She also teaches self-defense and expects to get her psychology degree this year.

1. Adverse Childhood Experiences Study. See <http://www.acestudy.org>

2. Trauma Healing Project. See <http://www.healingattention.org>

According to the article, the head of the Trauma Healing Project, Elaine Walters, said that “some people use alcohol to keep from reliving experiences that they may not even consciously remember.” (Emphasis added.)



“An ever shrinking group of therapists is still recovering hidden memories of incest from, or creating multiple personalities in their troubled clients. A Netherlands observer of the recovered memory scene, Hans Crombag, a forensic psychologist at Maastricht University, referred to this remnant as ‘The Dissociation Circuit — sloppy thinkers whose dangerous psychological theories resonate in naïve circles.’ [1] The trouble is that these therapists often work with very troubled clients, whose serious problems are further aggravated by their mentors’ misguided ministrations.”

Adriaan Mak

Joost Niemöller, J. (1996). The dissociation circuit. De Groene Amsterdammer, 127, (16), 16 - 24.

Available: http://www.groene.nl/1996/17/jn_cromb.html

English translation available: http://www.ipce.info/library_3/files/dissociation.htm:

The Adverse Childhood Experiences Study.

[FMS Foundation Newsletter, July/August 1998 Vol 7 No. 6](#)

Felitti V.J., Anda R.F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D.F., Spitz, A.M., Edwards, V., Koss, M.P., Marks, J.S. (1998). Relationship of Childhood Abuse and Household Dysfunction to Many of the Leading Causes of Death in Adults. *Am. J. Prev. Me.*, 14(4)

A questionnaire was mailed to 13,494 adults who had received medical evaluations at Kaiser Permanente in San Diego with a 70.5% response rate. The questionnaire contained seven categories of adverse childhood experiences: (1) physical, sexual or psychological abuse and (2) four measures of household dysfunction: substance abuse, mental illness, suicide attempts or imprisonment. A statistical analysis showed that the more categories of adverse child experiences, the greater the likelihood of adult multiple health risk factors.

The adult risk factors included: smoking, severe obesity, physical inactivity, depressed mood, suicide attempts, alcoholism, any drug abuse, parental drug abuse, high lifetime number of sexual partners and history of sexually transmitted disease. Disease conditions included ischemic heart disease, cancer, stroke, chronic bronchitis, emphysema, diabetes, hepatitis, and skeletal fractures.

The authors note the limitations of this study such as: self-report, retrospective, and the probability that some persons with disease may be more likely to report adverse childhood experiences. They state that the data can “only demonstrate associations between childhood exposures and health risk behaviors, health status, and diseases in adulthood.”

Nevertheless, after stating the limitations, the authors slide into the implication of causality. Specifically, the press release states the study “suggests that child abuse and household dysfunction lead to the development decades later of the chronic diseases that are the most common causes of death and disability in this country.” (Emphasis added.)

This is a violation of the most elementary rules taught in Psychology I. The fact that A is associated with B does not permit the conclusion that A leads to B. It is shocking to see an elementary mistake in such a comprehensive and expensive study.

Child abuse is wrong regardless of the consequences. Sloppy science undermines the cause.



Pittsburgh Area Man Again Convicted of Murder

Allegheny Pennsylvania County Common Pleas

(3rd U.S. Circuit Ct. of Appeals Case Nos. 03-4046 & 03-4219)

On January 23, 2007, an Allegheny County Pennsylvania Common Pleas Court jury of 10 women and two men found Steven Slutzker, 56, guilty of first-degree murder of the 1975 slaying of his neighbor John Mudd, Sr. This was the second time Slutzker had been convicted of shooting John Mudd, Sr. A jury in 1992 had also convicted Slutzker of murder.

In 2004, the 3rd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals upheld a state appeals court decision to overturn the 1992 conviction on the grounds that Slutzker's attorney had failed to present witnesses who said that Slutzker was with them at the time of the murder and also that the jury did not have an opportunity to see a police report in which a witness said that she had seen someone other than Slutzker at the scene of the murder. The federal court ordered Slutzker to be released or tried again.

Testimony in the new trial began on January 11, 2007 and the primary evidence was the recovered memory of the victim's son who was five-years-old at the time of the murder. Mudd, Jr. testified in both trials that in 1990 he had had a flashback of seeing Slutzker walk out of the basement soon after his father had been shot. Mudd, Jr., now 36, testified that he did not know what had happened to his father for the 15 years before his flashback. Mudd, Jr. also said that in his flashback his mother had been holding him, but he had not noted that in his previous 1992 testimony.

Under cross examination, Mudd, Jr. conceded that he had known since he was sixteen that his father had been murdered, long before the flashback. According to newspaper accounts, the testimony of a Catholic Charities social worker in the first trial was presented. That person had said that when Mudd, Jr. was 5-years-old he said "he was going to get Steve Slutzker and kill him," when he got older.

Prosecutors told the jury that the motive for the murder was that Slutzker, who had been having an affair with Mudd's wife, decided to kill Mudd, Sr. after he and his wife reconciled.

The defense presented witnesses who claimed that Slutzker was with them at the time of the murder. The prosecution, however, pointed out that one witness had a severe alcohol problem and the other admitted that his failing health had caused memory problems. The defense also pointed out a number of other discrepancies such as the lack of Slutzker's footprints in the snow at the time of the murder. The prosecutor said the footprints could have been

blown away.

The jury deliberated 8 hours and according to one jury member they "didn't convict on any one thing, but how it all fit together." After the verdict, Slutzker yelled, "I'm innocent. Are you paying attention?" Slutzker received a life sentence.

The Allegheny County Chief Deputy District Attorney was Daniel E. Fitzsimmons. David S. Shrager of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania represented Steven Slutzker, and Common Pleas Judge Jeffrey A. Manning presided.

The Innocence Institute of Point Park University has written about the Slutzker case and the article can be found at: <http://www.pointpark.edu/default.aspx?id=1276>.

Kerlik, B., Reilly, R.B. (2007, January 23). Wilksburg man convicted 2nd time in '75 'total recall' killing. *Pittsburgh Tribune-Review*.

Retrieved January 24, 2007 from http://www.pittsburghlive.com/x/pittsburghtrib/news/today/print_490003.html.

Moushey, B. (2007, January 23). Murder suspect's alibi: He was passed out drunk. *Post-Gazette.com*. Retrieved on January 23, 2007 from <http://www.jpost-gazette.com/pg/pp/07023/756056.stm>.



Canadian Supreme Court Bars Hypnosis-based Testimony

R. v. Trochym 2007 SCC6, Supreme Court of Canada, Docket 30717, Feb. 1, 2007. Decision available at:

<http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/2007/2007scc6/2007scc6.html>

In February, 2007, in a 6-3 ruling the Canadian Supreme Court said that the practice of using evidence from witnesses who have been hypnotized is scientifically and legally unreliable and should not be allowed in criminal trials. This appears to make Canada the first country that is based in the tradition of English criminal-law to place a total ban on hypnotically enhanced evidence. Police can still use hypnosis as investigative tool but they must have corroboration that is admissible in court.

Justice Marie Deschamps wrote for the majority that included Beverley McLachlin, Ian Binnie, Louis LeBel and Morris Fish and Justice Louise Charron.

"Although hypnosis has been the subject of numerous studies, these studies are either inconclusive or draw attention to the fact that hypnosis can, in certain circumstances, result in the distortion of memory."

Dissenting were Justices Michel Bastarache, Rosalie Abella and Marshall Rothstein who wrote: "These sorts of potential frailties with memory, whether ordinary or hypnotically refreshed, are those that juries are quite capable of weighing."

In the United States, the use of hypnotically enhanced evidence varies from state to state. In 2006, New Jersey joined 26 states that generally exclude its use.

Tibbetts, J. (2007, February 2). Top court bars hypnosis-based testimony. *Montreal Gazette*, A10.



Giving Back

Our daughter, "Dee," recanted in July 2006, eight years after accusing her grandfather (my father) of satanic and sexual abuse because of his affiliation with the Masons. When she retracted, Dee said almost immediately that she wanted to give back in any way that she could in an effort to make amends for the devastation that she had caused with her accusation.

One of the professors at the Portland Bible College in Portland, Oregon heard about Dee, and she asked her if she would be willing to talk about the experience with her students. The students were part of a class that was learning about counseling, and, in particular, the techniques of counseling individuals and families. Dee readily accepted the opportunity. It took several weeks before the time was arranged, but finally they agreed on a date: Thursday, March 1, 2007. There were approximately 20 students present.

Dee asked her husband and me to accompany her. She said that she wanted us to talk a little about our perspective at the end of her presentation. It was a very emotional event for me as I listened to her recount her experience of her "repressed memory" counseling. She explained why she felt that she had needed counseling, how she became involved with counselors who led her in a disastrous direction, what brought about her turnaround, and how she came to understand that her "memories" were never real memories at all but rather constructions of her imagination. I was amazed at how attentive the students were throughout the 50-minute class. They hung on her every word.

Dee explained that the book *Second Thoughts* by Dr. Paul Simpson was the eye opener for her. My wife

and I had given her the book to read after we discovered what a powerful message it brought to the false memory counseling. It took Dee a year and a half before she was finally willing to read the book. Once she did, she recognized herself as the exact profile of the victims who were described in the book and realized that what she had thought was real had really been false and had been implanted in her mind by the techniques of the counselor whom she saw weekly for ten months.

At the end of Dee's presentation the class asked questions and thanked her enthusiastically for taking the time to share her experience. Dee asked them to be prepared when they become counselors to be alert for any individuals or families who may have had experiences such as hers. She asked them to equip themselves with ways to help families out of such awful counseling.

I hope sharing this event with newsletter readers will give encouragement to others that there is always hope that truth will be found and that others who have been harmed by "repressed memory" counseling will also find a way to return home.

We thank the FMS Foundation for its work.

A Proud Dad



Accountability

In past newsletters, I have revealed my personal and professional experience with psychiatric services gone awry, specifically the diagnosis of MPD based on repressed memories. (See January-February 2004, Volume 13, No. 1) It is now sixteen years after my first professional exposure to this devastation.

When I began working at a medical center in LaCrosse, WI as a psychiatric social worker, I was appalled that women with real neurobiological disorders (e.g. bi-polar disorder, schizophrenia) were convinced by a psychiatrist and the therapists he trained that

they suffered from repressed memories. In fact, the psychiatrist was the director of psychiatric services for the county. As a social worker, I explored the experiences of these women through extensive social histories and personal interviews. The common element they shared was memory-retrieval therapy, often replacing pharmacological and other therapies. The result of this treatment was often that these women became psychotic and suicidal. If they were released from the hospital, they would only return to the inpatient psychiatric unit, unable to function in the outside world. But the therapists forged ahead with their treatment plan, with the professional community doing nothing to address the damaging therapy.

I believe that my own depressive collapse was precipitated by the stress of the trauma and injustice I witnessed as patients deteriorated under the treatment of this psychiatrist and the therapists he supervised. The lack of response by the psychiatric and social service system was alarming. The therapists who practiced memory-retrieval therapy thought themselves 'above' case management and 'above' treating people with severe and chronic mental illness. In my opinion, they were poorly trained social workers that wanted to be perceived as 'therapeutic giants.' They are directly responsible for disempowering women, for families experiencing unspeakable anguish, for mis-allocating the precious financial resources of county human services, and for defrauding medicine, Medicaid and private insurance companies.

I know of several professionals who are disillusioned with social work and who continue to press for consequences for these therapists. At least one practitioner of recovered-memory therapy has been reassigned (demoted) and can no longer conduct therapy. A second therapist from this group is still practicing but no longer does RMT. And even though the psychiatrist in

charge was eventually forced out of his position, he simply relocated to another state and resumed practicing psychiatry.

Many of the former patients whom I have seen in the past year are so disconnected from family that they live isolated lives. They are back on medication, often are viewed as 'crazy' and 'difficult' and are sometimes shunned by professionals and others. Some have found support, and sadly, others have died.

In my opinion, the practitioners of RMT have committed not only immoral and unethical acts, but have also committed fraud. They did not meet the basic standard of care and yet they got paid. They should be held accountable.

Claudia Dabbs, MSW



A Wonderful Return

After nearly ten years of no contact, our daughter accepted an invitation from her accused father to meet for lunch in her city. She and I had been in sporadic touch during the previous six years, but there had been a tacit agreement never to discuss serious family matters, and my optimism for a breakthrough had been waning. Although we could not know what enabled her to respond positively in this instance, we were cautiously joyful at the prospect. Finally, the day arrived, and she and her dad had an "ordinary" friendly visit, chattering for a couple of hours about work and family. There was no mention of the tragedy of the preceding decade.

Since that meeting, our entire family has been together twice, and my husband has finally started getting to know his granddaughter. We have at least two more family gatherings on the calendar in the coming months. So far, these events have taken place in neutral territory, but my husband and I look forward to a time in the future when we will comfortably spend time

in each other's homes as "normal" families do. We do not know if we will ever discuss openly with her what happened to our family.

The apparent return of our beloved daughter would have been much less likely, I think, were it not for the support we have received over the years from FMSF and from a few close friends and family members. The latter never shut the door on our daughter, despite their bewilderment, and occasional anger, at what was happening. Our son, in particular, walked the fine and agonizing line of maintaining loving relationships with us as well as with his older sister, exhibiting a maturity beyond his years, particularly at the onset of this odyssey when he was relatively young. Many extended family members also made the effort to keep in positive touch with our daughter despite the distance she put between herself and all of us and the lack of evidence that any of their efforts were being rewarded.

For its part, the Foundation, of course, provided us with crucial information; but it was also a source of ongoing encouragement, especially in the "From Our Readers" section of the Newsletter. Like many grieving parents, we often went first to those letters to look for any shred of hope that our nightmare would eventually end. The accounts of returning children, some after more than a decade, helped us continue both to keep the door open to our daughter and to prevent ourselves from drowning in sorrow, self-pity, or bitterness. Our entire family owes a great debt to the work of the Foundation, as well as to all the accused, returned, and retracted who have shared their stories over the years.

Thanks to each of you; and may all of our families continue to find a path toward wholeness.

One more mom



"Nothing fixes a thing so intensely in the memory as the wish to forget it"

Michel de Montaigne

Help Needed

My names Louise Turner and I am a member of the British False Memory Society and am also a retractor. I am a second year Sociology student at the University of Derby and I am undertaking a module in research. The questionnaire aims to look at patterns and trends which can be identified by those affected by the existence of False Memory Syndrome on either a personal or professional level. The questionnaire is suitable for anyone who has dealt with False Memory Syndrome.

This questionnaire is completely confidential and all data will be anonymised prior to being placed onto a database for use within my research only. Any names used in my final research paper will be changed to protect your anonymity. You can withdraw from this study at any point and do not have to give a reason unless you wish to do so. If you would like a copy of the report at the end please provide at least one contact option where I can send you a copy via mail, email or fax. These contact details will be removed from your answers to the questionnaire to ensure confidentiality is upheld at all times.

Thank you.

Louise Turner

c/o Rebecca Barnes, Sociology
Education, Health and Sciences

University of Derby, Kedleston Road
Derby, DE22 1 GB

L.Turner5@student.derby.ac.uk

To take the survey, go to:

<http://www.studentlou.com/study.htm>

The link to my own story about false memory is: <http://www.studentlou.com/anightmaretoomany.htm>

If you do not have access to a computer

but would still like to complete the survey, write to the FMSF and we will send you a copy.

The Passing of Ray Souza

By Frank Kane

For most of us, the first time we knew of Ray Souza was on or about April 19, 1993, when he and Shirley stared out at us from the cover of the national magazine, *Newsweek*. The picture was an unflattering one and the story headline even more startling. It read, "CHILD ABUSE: A court found the Souzas guilty of molesting their grandchildren. They cry 'Witchhunt.' When does the fight to protect our kids go too far?"

In many subsequent news articles over the years, Ray and Shirley became simply the "grandparents from Lowell," and we all knew to whom the article referred.

Judge Elizabeth Dolan, now retired, convicted them in a bench trial on the typical, spurious "evidence" coerced from their grandchildren, e.g.; "attacks by machines as big as a room, forced to drink green potions, locked in cages in the basement of their Lowell home." A doctor from Boston Children's Hospital, with no hard copy of anything in her possession, gave evidence that she saw some anomaly in a child's anal medical exam, two years previous to her current testimony (the anomaly, it turned out, was within the range of "normal," according to a subsequent study the doctor herself submitted to a medical journal).

Dolan assigned Shirley and Ray to house arrest, pending appeals. Further legal actions took place over the years, the most notable being a turn-down by the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, which told the Souzas that, even though their constitutional rights were violated by the lack of face-to-face confrontation, their trial was still a fair trial. In the very same week in November, 1995, the Massachusetts Department of Corrections had to ship 299 inmates to jails in Texas because of overcrowding, Assistant District Attorney

Martha Coakley attempted to have the Souzas removed from their home and incarcerated, separately, in the same overcrowded institutions. Dolan demurred from doing so.

In fact, the Souzas remained in their home for a total of nine years, able to leave only to go once a week to church and, with prior permission, to medical appointments. Shirley's sister, Eleanor, shopped for food, clothing, and household needs every week for those nine years, a true labor of love.

We all know now that Judge Dolan adamantly refused to allow testimony (with no objection raised by their lawyer, Robert George), from the Souzas' youngest, unmarried daughter, the source of the initial recovered repressed memory of her childhood sexual abuse, incidentally "disclosed" in a nightmare of being raped by her father with a crucifix. This daughter then informed her married sister and sister-in-law that their children were probably also being molested by Mom and Dad. Hysteria ensued.

From that point on, the case went from one of repressed-memory recovery to the interrogation of the grandchildren using sexually-explicit dolls. It mirrored events during 1984 to 1987 in the Fells Acres Case, when the Amirault Family was convicted of bizarre "disclosures," and "fresh-complaint hearsay," with no actual, credible evidence. The Amiraults and Souzas were tried and convicted by the same District Attorney, Children's Hospital experts, and judge.

Ray Souza tried stoically to live in the present, always buoying up Shirley and never dwelling on what had happened to them, as horribly unjust as it was. Whenever we discussed false memory syndrome, Ray would assume a look of quiet comprehension, a tacit acknowledgment that said, "Yeah, I know what happened to us, and it isn't fair, but can anyone tell me *why* and *how*?" He could not understand how these loved children and grandchildren

could say such untrue things about them.

In 2002, their house arrest ended and the ankle bracelets came off. But soon roles reversed and Shirley was supporting Ray in his illness. I felt that Ray still wanted the answer to the *why* and the *how* of the accusations.

Ray and Shirley enjoyed the companionship of the two sons and three grandchildren who returned. Sadly, some other members of the extended Souza family still refuse to accept the sons back. These relatives are still angry at the harm done to Ray and Shirley.

Looking back through the many articles about the Souzas, only a few contained quotes from Ray. In an August, 1995 article following their rejection of their first appeal, he said, when asked by a reporter how he felt about going to prison, "These things [we were accused of] never happened. I feel good about myself, no matter which way I go," [to prison or to stay at home]. And he went on, "We'll win. We'll win someday. I don't know when. We're innocent people, and we've suffered enough and maybe someone will recant. Who knows what will happen? You just have to look forward."

I like to think that Ray is now in a place where his innocence is known and proclaimed. When I think of Ray, I think of the 10th verse of the Sermon on the Mount: "Blessed are they that suffer persecution for justice's sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

We will miss Ray and his quiet strength. We know that FMSF members join me in sending love and condolences to Shirley and to the rest of their family.

□

"Everybody needs his memories. They keep the wolf of insignificance from the door."

Saul Bellow

Web Sites of Interest

<http://www.theisticsatanism.com/asp/>
Against Satanic Panics

comp.uark.edu/~lampinen/read.html
The Lampinen Lab False Memory Reading Group,
University of Arkansas

www.exploratorium.edu/memory/
The Exploratorium Memory Exhibit

www.tmdArchives.org
The Memory Debate Archives

www.francefms.com
French language website

www.psychoheresy-aware.org/ministry.html
The Bobgans question Christian counseling

www.IllinoisFMS.org
Illinois-Wisconsin FMS Society

www.ltech.net/OHIOarmhp
Ohio Group

www.afma.asn.au
Australian False Memory Association

www.bfms.org.uk
British False Memory Society

www.geocities.com/retractor
This site is run by Laura Pasley (retractor)
www.sirs.com/uptonbooks/index.htm
Upton Books

www.angelfire.com/tx/recoveredmemories/
Locate books about FMS
Recovered Memory Bookstore

www.religioustolerance.org/sra.htm
Information about Satanic Ritual Abuse

www.angryparents.net
Parents Against Cruel Therapy

www.geocities.com/newcosanz
New Zealand FMS Group

www.werkgroepwfh.nl
Netherlands FMS Group

www.falseallegation.org
National Child Abuse
Defense & Resource Center

www.nasw.org/users/markp
Excerpts from *Victims of Memory*

www.rickross.com/groups/fsm.html
Ross Institute

www.hopkinsmedicine.org/jhpsychiatry/perspec1.htm
Perspectives for Psychiatry
by Paul McHugh

www.enigma.se/info/FFI.htm
FMS in Scandanavia - Janet Hagbom

www.ncrj.org/
National Center for Reason & Justice

www.lyingspirits.com

Skeptical Information on Theophostic Counseling

www.ChildrenInTherapy.org/
Information about Attachment Therapy

www.traumaversterking.nl
English language web site of Dutch retractor.

www.quackwatch.org
This site is run by Stephen Barrett, M.D.

www.stopbadtherapy.org
Contains information about filing complaints.

www.FMSFonline.org
Web site of FMS Foundation.

Legal Web Sites of Interest

- www.caseassist.com

- www.findlaw.com

- www.legalengine.com

- www.accused.com

Elizabeth Loftus

www.seweb.uci.edu/faculty/loftus/

The Rutherford Family Speaks to FMS Families

The DVD made by the Rutherford family is *the* most popular DVD of FMSF families. It covers the complete story from accusation, to retraction and reconciliation. Family members describe the things they did to cope and to help reunite. Of particular interest are Beth Rutherford's comments about what her family did that helped her to retract and return.

Available in DVD format only:

To order send request to

FMSF -DVD, 1955 Locust St.
Philadelphia, PA 19103

\$10.00 per DVD; Canada add \$4.00;
other countries add \$10.00

Make checks payable to FMS
Foundation

Recommended Books

Remembering Trauma

Richard McNally

Science and Pseudoscience in Clinical Psychology

S. O. Lilienfeld, S.J. Lynn, J.M. Lohr (eds.)

Psychology Astray:

Fallacies in Studies of "Repressed Memory" and Childhood Trauma

by Harrison G. Pope, Jr., M.D.

HUNGRY FOR MONSTERS

The 2003 film *Hungry for Monsters* by George Csicsery has been re-released on a new DVD containing 40 minutes of additional scenes exploring the background of recovered memories in the Althaus case. When 15-year-old Nicole Althaus told a teacher that her father was molesting her, the quiet affluent Pittsburgh suburb of Mt. Lebanon, Pennsylvania, was turned inside out. Nicole's father, Rick, was arrested and charged with sexually abusing Nicole amidst bizarre satanic rituals. With the support of her favorite teacher, police, therapists, social workers, and officers of the court, all of whom believed her stories, Nicole began to embellish her initial accusations. As she recovered more memories of wild orgies, sacrificed babies, and murder, more people were arrested, including her mother and a pair of strangers.

A year later, all charges were dropped, and Nicole admitted that her accusations were false. After Nicole and her parents reconciled, they sued the authorities.

Hungry for Monsters DVD

Released by Facets MultiMedia on October 31, 2006. To order copies contact Facets MultiMedia, or rent it on Netflix.

<http://www.facets.org/asticat?function=buyitem&catname=facets&catnum=DV71523>

The film has also been acquired by Teachers TV, a UK cable channel for educators.

<http://www.teachers.tv/video/4861>

For more information about *Hungry for Monsters* see
www.zalafilms.com

George Csicsery
POB 22833
Oakland CA 94609 USA
(510) 428-9284

CONTACTS & MEETINGS - UNITED STATES

ALABAMA

See Georgia

ALASKA

Kathleen 907-333-5248

ARIZONA

Phoenix

Pat 480-396-9420

ARKANSAS

Little Rock

Al & Lela 870-363-4368

CALIFORNIA

Sacramento

Jocelyn 530-570-1862

San Francisco & North Bay

Charles 415-435-9618

San Francisco & South Bay

Eric 408-738-0469

East Bay Area

Judy 925-952-4853

Central Coast

Carole 805-967-8058

Palm Desert

Eileen and Jerry 909-659-9636

Central Orange County

Chris & Alan 949-733-2925

Covina Area

Floyd & Libby 626-357-2750

San Diego Area

Dee 760-439-4630

COLORADO

Colorado Springs

Doris 719-488-9738

CONNECTICUT

S. New England

Earl 203-329-8365 or

Paul 203-458-9173

FLORIDA

Dade/Broward

Madeline 954-966-4FMS

Central Florida - Please call for mtg. time

John & Nancy 352-750-5446

Sarasota

Francis & Sally 941-342-8310

Tampa Bay Area

Bob & Janet 727-856-7091

GEORGIA

Atlanta

Wallie & Jill 770-971-8917

ILLINOIS

Chicago & Suburbs - 1st Sun. (MO)

Eileen 847-985-7693 or

Liz & Roger 847-827-1056

Peoria

Bryant & Lynn 309-674-2767

INDIANA

Indiana Assn. for Responsible Mental Health Practices

Pat 260-489-9987

Helen 574-753-2779

KANSAS

Wichita - Meeting as called

Pat 785-762-2825

KENTUCKY

Louisville- Last Sun. (MO) @ 2pm

Bob 502-367-1838

LOUISIANA

Sarah 337-235-7656

MAINE

Rumford

Carolyn 207-364-8891

Portland - 4th Sun. (MO)

Wally & Bobby 207-878-9812

MASSACHUSETTS/NEW ENGLAND

Andover - 2nd Sun. (MO) @ 1pm

Frank 978-263-9795

MICHIGAN

Greater Detroit Area

Nancy 248-642-8077

Ann Arbor

Martha 734-439-4055

MINNESOTA

Terry & Collette 507-642-3630

Dan & Joan 651-631-2247

MISSOURI

Kansas City - Meeting as called

Pat 785-738-4840

Springfield - Quarterly (4th Sat. of Apr.,

Jul., Oct., Jan.) @12:30pm

Tom 417-753-4878

Roxie 417-781-2058

MONTANA

Lee & Avone 406-443-3189

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Jean 603-772-2269

Mark 802-872-0847

NEW JERSEY

Sally 609-927-4147 (Southern)

Nancy 973-729-1433 (Northern)

NEW MEXICO

Albuquerque - 2nd Sat. (BI-MO) @1 pm

Southwest Room -Presbyterian Hospital

Maggie 505-662-7521(after 6:30pm) or

Sy 505-758-0726

NEW YORK

Westchester, Rockland, etc.

Barbara 914-922-1737

Upstate/Albany Area

Elaine 518-399-5749

NORTH CAROLINA

Susan 704-538-7202

OHIO

Cleveland

Bob & Carole 440-356-4544

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma City

Dee 405-942-0531 or

Tulsa

Jim 918-582-7363

OREGON

Portland area

Kathy 503-655-1587

PENNSYLVANIA

Harrisburg

Paul & Betty 717-691-7660

Pittsburgh

Rick & Renee 412-563-5509

Montrose

John 570-278-2040

Wayne (includes S. NJ)

Jim & Jo 610-783-0396

TENNESSEE

Nashville

Kate 615-665-1160

TEXAS

Houston

Jo or Beverly 713-464-8970

El Paso

Mary Lou 915-595-3945

UTAH

Keith 801-467-0669

VERMONT

Mark 802-872-0847

WASHINGTON

See Oregon

WISCONSIN

Katie & Leo 414-476-0285 or

Susanne & John 608-427-3686

WYOMING

Alan & Lorinda 307-322-4170

CONTACTS & MEETINGS - INTERNATIONAL

BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA

Vancouver & Mainland

Lloyd 250-741-8941

Victoria & Vancouver Island

John 250-721-3219

MANITOBA CANADA

Roma 204-275-5723

ONTARIO, CANADA

London

Adriaan 519-471-6338

Ottawa

Eileen 613-836-3294

Burlington

Ken & Marina 905-637-6030

Waubushene

Paula 705-543-0318

QUEBEC, CANADA

Chertsey

Mavis 450-882-1480

AUSTRALIA

Evelyn everei@adam.com.au

BELGIUM

werkgr.fict.herinneringen@altavista.net

ISRAEL

FMS ASSOCIATION fax-972-2-625-9282

NEW ZEALAND

Colleen 09-416-7443

SWEDEN

Ake Moller FAX 48-431-217-90

UNITED KINGDOM

The British False Memory Society

Madeline 44-1225 868-682

Deadline for the Summer 2007 issue is June 1. Meeting notices **MUST** be in writing and should be sent no later than **two months before meeting.**

Copyright © 2007 by the FMS Foundation

1955 Locust Street

Philadelphia, PA 19103-5766

Phone: 215-940-1040

Fax: 215-940-1042

mail@FMSFonline.org

www.FMSFonline.org

ISSN # 1069-0484

Pamela Freyd, Ph.D., Executive Director

FMSF Scientific and Professional Advisory Board

April 1, 2007

Aaron T. Beck, M.D., D.M.S., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Terence W. Campbell, Ph.D.**, Clinical and Forensic Psychology, Sterling Heights, MI; **Rosalind Cartwright, Ph.D.**, Rush Presbyterian St. Lukes Medical Center, Chicago, IL; **Jean Chapman, Ph.D.**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; **Loren Chapman, Ph.D.**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI; **Frederick C. Crews, Ph.D.**, University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Robyn M. Dawes, Ph.D.**, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA; **David F. Dinges, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Henry C. Ellis, Ph.D.**, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM; **Fred H. Frankel, MBChB, DPM**, Harvard University Medical School; **George K. Ganaway, M.D.**, Emory University of Medicine, Atlanta, GA; **Martin Gardner**, Author, Hendersonville, NC; **Rochel Gelman, Ph.D.**, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ; **Henry Gleitman, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Lila Gleitman, Ph.D.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Richard Green, M.D., J.D.**, Charing Cross Hospital, London; **David A. Halperin, M.D.**, (deceased) Mount Sinai School of Medicine, New York, NY; **Ernest Hilgard, Ph.D.**, (deceased) Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA; **John Hochman, M.D.**, UCLA Medical School, Los Angeles, CA; **David S. Holmes, Ph.D.**, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS; **Philip S. Holzman, Ph.D.**, (deceased) Harvard University, Cambridge, MA; **Robert A. Karlin, Ph.D.**, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ; **Harold Lief, M.D.**, (deceased) University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Elizabeth Loftus, Ph.D.**, University of California, Irvine, CA; **Susan L. McElroy, M.D.**, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH; **Paul McHugh, M.D.**, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD; **Harold Merskey, D.M.**, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada; **Spencer Harris Morfit**, Author, Westford, MA; **Ulric Neisser, Ph.D.**, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; **Richard Ofshe, Ph.D.**, University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Emily Carota Orne, B.A.**, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Martin Orne, M.D., Ph.D.**, (deceased) University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA; **Loren Pankratz, Ph.D.**, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR; **Campbell Perry, Ph.D.**, (deceased) Concordia University, Montreal, Canada; **Michael A. Persinger, Ph.D.**, Laurentian University, Ontario, Canada; **August T. Piper, Jr., M.D.**, Seattle, WA; **Harrison Pope, Jr., M.D.**, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA; **James Randi**, Author and Magician, Plantation, FL; **Henry L. Roediger, III, Ph.D.**, Washington University, St. Louis, MO; **Carolyn Saari, Ph.D.**, Loyola University, Chicago, IL; **Theodore Sarbin, Ph.D.**, (deceased) University of California, Santa Cruz, CA; **Thomas A. Sebeok, Ph.D.**, (deceased) Indiana University, Bloomington, IN; **Michael A. Simpson, M.R.C.S., L.R.C.P., M.R.C., D.O.M.**, Center for Psychosocial & Traumatic Stress, Pretoria, South Africa; **Margaret Singer, Ph.D.**, (deceased) University of California, Berkeley, CA; **Ralph Slovenko, J.D., Ph.D.**, Wayne State University Law School, Detroit, MI; **Donald Spence, Ph.D.**, Robert Wood Johnson Medical Center, Piscataway, NJ; **Jeffrey Victor, Ph.D.**, Jamestown Community College, Jamestown, NY; **Hollida Wakefield, M.A.**, Institute of Psychological Therapies, Northfield, MN; **Charles A. Weaver, III, Ph.D.**, Baylor University, Waco, TX

Do you have access to e-mail? Send a message to

pjf@cis.upenn.edu

if you wish to receive electronic versions of this newsletter and notices of radio and television broadcasts about FMS. All the message need say is "add to the FMS-News". It would be useful, but not necessary, if you add your full name (all addresses and names will remain strictly confidential).

The False Memory Syndrome Foundation is a qualified 501(c)3 corporation with its principal offices in Philadelphia and governed by its Board of Directors. While it encourages participation by its members in its activities, it must be understood that the Foundation has no affiliates and that no other organization or person is authorized to speak for the Foundation without the prior written approval of the Executive Director. All membership dues and contributions to the Foundation must be forwarded to the Foundation for its disposition.

The FMSF Newsletter will be published 4 times in 2007 by the False Memory Syndrome Foundation. Starting in 2007, the newsletter will be delivered electronically. It is also available at on the FMSF website: www.FMSFonline.org Those without access to the Internet should contact the Foundation.

Your Contribution Will Help

PLEASE FILL OUT ALL INFORMATION
PLEASE PRINT

__ Visa: Card # & exp. date: _____

__ Discover: Card # & exp. date: _____

__ Mastercard: # & exp. date: _____
(Minimum credit card is \$25)

__ Check or Money Order: Payable to FMS Foundation in U.S. dollars

Signature: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

State, ZIP (+4) _____

Country: _____

Phone: (_____) _____

Fax: (_____) _____

Thank you for your generosity.